

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/679,667	10/06/2003	Bret A. Ferree	BAF-15102/29	4076	
7:	7590 06/02/2005			EXAMINER	
John G. Posa			REIMERS, ANNETTE R		
Gifford, Krass,	Groh, Sprinkle,		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
Anderson & Citkowski, P.C.			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
280 N. Old Woodward Ave., Suite 400 Birmingham, MI 48009-5394			3732		
			DATE MAILED: 06/02/2005		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/679,667	FERREE, BRET A.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Annette R. Reimers	3732			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timed within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDONEE.	ely filed will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
·	action is non-final.	secution as to the merits is			
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims					
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.					
Application Papers					
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) ☑ The drawing(s) filed on 17 March 2005 is/are: a Applicant may not request that any objection to the o Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner	a) accepted or b) objected to drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obje	37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Application ity documents have been received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No d in this National Stage			
Attachment(s)					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary (Paper No(s)/Mail Dat 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:	e			

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Beer et al. (U.S. Patent Number 5,458,642).

Beer et al. disclose a multiaxial artificial disc replacement comprising a lower component adapted for fixation to an inferior vertebral body, 11b, an upper component, 11a, adapted for fixation to a superior vertebral body (see figure 1), and an element, 13a-13e, that allows movement between the lower and upper components along two separate, independent orthogonal axes, wherein one of the axes is generally medial-lateral and the other axis is generally anterior-posterior (see figure 1 and column 2, lines 49-58).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grooms et al. (WO 99/21515).

Beer et al. disclose the claimed invention except for the element being a cruciate -shaped axle. Mehdizadeh discloses a multiaxial artificial disc replacement comprising a lower component, 12, an upper component, 11, and an element, 19, between the components (see figure 2). Mehdizadeh further shows that the element can be a coil spring or a cruciate-shaped spring (see figures 2 and 9, respectively), and he teaches that these are functionally equivalent structures. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to construct the device of Beer et al. with the element being a cruciate-shaped spring instead of a coil spring, in view of Mehdizadeh, as such would merely constitute a substitution of functionally equivalent structures.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-4 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See PTO-892 for art cited of interest.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Annette R. Reimers whose telephone number is (571) 272-7135. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 9:00AM-6:30PM.

Application/Control Number: 10/679,667

Art Unit: 3732

Page 4

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kevin Shaver can be reached on (571) 272-4720. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

AR

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700